

REMARKS

Applicant requests entry of the present claim amendments as placing the application in condition for allowance or reducing the issues for consideration on appeal. The Final Office Action cites new prior art references to reject the claims as amended by Applicant's January 12, 2006 Amendment. Applicant has carefully reviewed the cited references and submits that the claims as they now stand are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons explained below.

Independent Amended Claims 6 and 16 are Patentable over Berard in view of Grigonis

Independent Claims 6 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,906,817 to Berard (hereinafter "Berard") in view of Grigonis publication entitled "The Many Faces of Fax Personalities" (hereinafter "Grigonis"). Applicant respectfully submits that many of the recitations of these independent claims are neither taught nor suggested by the cited combination.

Independent Claim 6 recites:

6. A method of routing print files in a computer system, the method comprising:
evaluating content of at least one print file based on a routing policy, wherein the print file is configured by an application for printing on a printer device; and
selectively routing the print file based on the evaluated content of the at least one print file to a non-printer device instead of to a printer device in response to the evaluated content of the print file.

Accordingly, a print file, which is configured by an application for printing on a printer device, is selectively routed to a non-printer device instead of to a printer device in response to the evaluation of the content of the print file.

In sharp contrast, Berard describes in columns 5-6 a system that automatically determines from a document a "facsimile telephone number of [an] intended recipient" so that the document can be sent by facsimile. (Berard, Col. 6, lines 63-64). The system carries out a data extraction process to either directly extract the "facsimile telephone number of the intended recipient" from the document or to

extract a "recipient name from the document and then refer ... to a databank to find the facsimile telephone number of the intended recipient". (Berard, Col. 5, lines 52-55, Col. 6, lines 63-64).

In rejecting Claim 6, the Final Office Action concedes that Berard does not describe that a print file is evaluated based on a routing policy. However, the Final Office Action contends that Berard, at Col. 7, lines 6-10, discloses the recitation of Claim 6 of "selectively routing the print file to a non-printer device instead of to a printer device in response to the evaluated content of the print file." The cited portion of Berard is repeated below for convenience of reference:

The result, indicated at 120, is that the system has all the needed information to send the facsimile to the recipient. The document can then be passed to the facsimile transmission sever for e-mail or telephone transmission to the recipient.

(Berard, Col. 7, lines 6-10).

Although Berard describes that the document is passed to a facsimile transmission server for e-mail or telephone transmission to the recipient, nowhere does Berard describe that the facsimile transmission server would make a decision as to whether to selectively route the document either by e-mail or by telephone transmission in response the system's evaluation of the content of the print file.

Moreover, Applicant submits that Grigonis does not supply what is explained above as missing from the teachings of Berard. Grigonis describes a software product that transforms an application's output into an electronic document that can be delivered by the web, wireless email, distributed printed or "hybrid mail". (Grigonis, Page 5). However, nowhere does Grigonis describe that the content of a print file is evaluated for the purpose of selectively routing the print file to a non-printer device instead of to a printer device.

Applicant therefore submits that the combination of Berard and Grigonis do not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Claim 6 and, therefore, that Claim 6 is patentable over those references.

Claim 16 is a computer program product that contains similar recitations to Claim 6 and is submitted to be patentable over Berard in view of Grigonis for at least the reasons explained above from Claim 6.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6 and 16 is respectfully requested.

Dependent Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15, and 17-20 are patentable at least pursuant to their dependencies from allowable independent Claim 6 or 16.

Independent Claim 21 is Patentable over Berard in view of Grigonis and Luo

Independent Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Berard in view of Grigonis and further in view of a publication by Luo entitled "Content Management on Server Farm with Layer-7 Routing" (hereinafter "Luo"). Applicant respectfully submits that many of the recitations of Claim 21 are neither taught nor suggested by the cited combination.

Claim 21 recites:

21. A method of routing print files in a computer system, the method comprising:
searching content of a print file to identify one or more keywords that are defined by a routing policy, wherein the print file is configured by an application for printing on a printer device; and
selectively renaming the print file based on identifying the one or more keywords in the print file instead of routing the print file to a printing device.

Accordingly, Claim 21 recites that a print file, which is configured by an application for printing on a printing device, is selectively: 1) renamed; or 2) routed to a printing device, based on identification of one or more keywords in the print file that are defined by a routing policy.

The Final Office Action concedes on Page 8 that the combination of Berard and Grigonis does not teach or suggest that a print file is selectively either renamed or routing to a printer device based on identification of one or more keywords in the print file. However, the Final Office Action contends that Luo discloses "renaming a file to support content-based routing" at Page 1137, Col. 2, Section 4.2, para. 1.

Although the cited portion of Luo describes that files or directories may be renamed, such renaming is carried out by a management system to allow a Web page to be distributed across a "cluster-based Web server system". (See Luo, Paras. 4.0,

4.2, 4.3). Luo describes that before "web objects are placed into the server farm, a program will parse the html files and script files ... to create an internal data structure ... [and] the program will use [a] hash function ... to convert the original name of every directory and file into a fixed length and formatted name." (Luo, Para 4.3). Another program can then "modify the embedded hyperlinks of all the html files and script files to conform [to] the new name[, and then] the contents are placed onto the server nodes in a converted name." (Luo, Para 4.3). Accordingly, files are renamed and then placed onto a cluster of server nodes. Nowhere does Luo describe that a file is selectively either renamed or it is routed based on identification of one or more keywords in the file. Furthermore, regarding the particular recitations of Claim 21, Luo does not describe that a print file is selectively either renamed or it is routed to a printing device based on identification of one or more keywords in the print file.

Applicant therefore submits that the combination of Berard, Grigonis, and Luo do not teach or suggest each and every recitation of Claim 21 and, therefore, that Claim 21 is patentable over those references.

Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of Claim 21 is respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 15, which have been amended to depend from Claims 6 and 16, respectfully, contain similar recitations to Claim 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that Claims 5 and 15 are patentable over Berard in view of Grigonis and further in view of Luo for at least the reasons that have been explained for Claim 21.

CONCLUSION

Applicant requests entry of the present claim amendments as placing the application in condition for allowance or reducing the issues for consideration on appeal. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested in view of the claim amendments and remarks herein. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

In re: Harry Michael Schell
Serial No.: 10/627,110
Filed: July 25, 2003
Page 10

Respectfully submitted,



David K. Purks
Registration No. 40,133
Attorney for Applicant(s)

USPTO Customer No. 39072
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P. O. Box 37428
Raleigh, North Carolina 27627
Telephone: 919/854-1400
Facsimile: 919/854-1401

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on May 25, 2006.


Audra Wooten